

**Comments on the proposed conservation of the specific name of *Xerophila geyeri* Soós, 1926 (Mollusca, Gastropoda)**  
(Case 2870; see BZN 51: 105–107, 336–338; 52: 176–178, 331–333)

(1) Dietrich Kadolsky

'The Limes', 66 Heathhurst Road, Sanderstead, South Croydon, Surrey CR2 0BA, U.K.

Prof Gittenberger, in his critique (BZN 52: 259–260) of my previous comment (BZN 52: 176–178), seems to believe that I was referring to himself with my mention of 'sloppy work'. This was never intended, as should have been evident from the context of my comment.

Gittenberger chose to refer to 'the graveyard of synonymy' even in the title of his (1993) paper. In his application (BZN 51: 105–107, para. 3) Gittenberger explains that the five names he proposes for suppression were created by disciples of the 'Nouvelle École' of French malacologists which was notorious for promoting species splitting. The merits, or otherwise, of this school are, however, not at issue in the application concerning *Trochoidea geyeri* (Soós, 1926). It would be totally undesirable for the stability of nomenclature if acceptance of names on the basis of scientific merit of the original publication were to become part of nomenclatural practice.

The 'new respect' (para. 5 of Gittenberger's comment) which systematics may have gained is not based on a particular version of the rules of nomenclature. Gittenberger's implication that systematists must choose between my 'dogma' and respectable nomenclature is rather unrealistic, apart from overrating my contribution. I put forward (BZN 52: 177) a reasoned proposal (to adopt *Helix arceuthophila* Mabille, 1881 as the valid name), not a dogma. While Gittenberger feels he needs to prevent readers from 'falling prey' to my proposal, I expect them to be sufficiently capable of judging for themselves the merits of my proposal and his comment.

My view (BZN 52: 177) that *Trochoidea geyeri* is one of the less frequent species of European land snail is based on my own collecting experience as well as on published information. This is not invalidated by Gittenberger's view that the species name *geyeri* is well known. In the first sentence of my previous comment I acknowledged that Gittenberger's application to conserve the name *geyeri* is perfectly admissible under the Code, but I drew attention to the fact that the species is known mainly amongst collectors and taxonomists, who experience name changes all the time. A stronger case for conserving the name *geyeri* could be made if the species were widely known under this name by non-taxonomist biologists, and/or in agriculture, medicine and in the popular literature; however, to my knowledge, this is not the case.

(2) Bernard Hausdorf

Zoologisches Institut und Zoologisches Museum der Universität Hamburg,  
Martin-Luther-King-Platz 3, D-20146 Hamburg, Germany

I am in favour of the proposal to conserve the specific name of *Xerophila geyeri* Soós, 1926 by the suppression of the five unused senior subjective synonyms cited by Gittenberger in his application (BZN 51: 105–107), and by the suppression of

*Xerophila striata* f. *minor* Geyer, 1817 (para. 1 of the comment by Falkner & Proschwitz, BZN 52: 331–332).

I have the impression that purely theoretical considerations, as well as general discussion about Article 79c of the Code and about the 'Nouvelle École', have obscured the facts of this case.

It is the purpose of the Principle of Priority and the Code in general to promote stability and not 'to upset a long-accepted name in its accustomed meaning through the introduction of an unused name that is its senior synonym' (Article 23b). The case for *geyeri* meets the two requirements for the suppression of unused senior synonyms specified in Article 79c. The five earlier names have not been used as valid during the preceding 100 years (not only the preceding 50 years). In view of this, Bouchet's argument (BZN 51: 336–338) that the names are not 'forgotten' but 'misinterpreted' is insignificant. Secondly, *geyeri* has been applied to the molluscan species as its valid name by far more than five different authors and in far more than 10 publications during the preceding 50 years (see Gittenberger, 1993c, para. 5 of the application, and Gittenberger's comment on BZN 51: 338). In contrast to Bouchet's (BZN 51: 336–338) and Kadolsky's (BZN 52: 176–178) views, *T. geyeri* is known not only to a small circle of specialist workers and collectors of land snails but also in various subdisciplines of biology (see Gittenberger, BZN 51: 338). It is known to paleontologists as well as to ecologists and is included in several Red Lists. There is no provision in the Code that requires a species to be of public interest for a universally used name to be conserved. In their comments Bouchet, Kadolsky and Falkner & Proschwitz (52: 331–333) have not denied that the *prima facie* requirements of Article 79c are met in this case and I can see no reason for rejecting Gittenberger's proposal.

It is true that the nomenclature of Palaearctic pulmonates in general has not yet attained the desired stability. However, in contrast to Bouchet (para. 5 of his comment), I cannot see a connection between the proposed suppression of unused senior synonyms of a hitherto unchallenged and widely used name and name changes of other taxa in the HYGROMIIDAE, or between the proposed suppression and the fact that every new species of Palaearctic pulmonate may not yet have been discovered.

Falkner & Proschwitz stated in their comment (para. 3) that they are 'opposed to the general trend of neglecting critical revisory systematic studies'. Similar statements can be found in Kadolsky's comment. Although I am sure that these are not intended as accusations against Gittenberger, I think it necessary to emphasize that Gittenberger (and not Bouchet, Falkner, Kadolsky or Proschwitz) was the first and only one to revise the types of the senior synonyms of *Trochoidea geyeri* which were described more than a hundred years ago. It would, indeed, have been desirable to confirm the conspecificity of these taxa with *T. geyeri* by anatomical studies of topotypical material. Nevertheless, I think that it is justified to place the five senior names in the synonymy of *T. geyeri* on the strength of a conchological study. In the areas from which these names were described there are no known species which cannot be distinguished from *geyeri* by shell characters, and it is rather improbable that there are unknown species which are conchologically identical with *T. geyeri*.

We are indebted to Gittenberger (1993a–c) for not only the time-consuming revision of about 80 names introduced by the 'Nouvelle École', but also the qualified evaluation of these names. He did not 'reject in bulk all the names introduced by

these authors', as Bouchet has stated (para. 3 of his comment), but has rehabilitated some of them, placed most of them in the synonymy of well known senior names, and proposed the suppression of only five names which threaten an unchallenged, widely known junior name. It would have been easier for Gittenberger to replace *T. geyeri* with one of the senior names, as recommended by Bouchet and Kadolsky, rather than submit a proposal in line with the Code's explicit provisions on maintaining stability. I suspect that no one else will do such a time-consuming revision and prepare a proposal to stabilize the nomenclature if this well substantiated proposal is rejected.

## References

- Gittenberger, E. 1993a. Digging in the graveyard of synonymy, in search of Portuguese species of *Candidula* Kobelt, 1871 (Mollusca: Gastropoda Pulmonata: Hygromiidae). *Zoologische Mededelingen*. 67(17): 283–293.
- Gittenberger, E. 1993b. On *Ceruella virgata* (Da Costa, 1778) and two Iberian *Xerosecta* species (Mollusca: Gastropoda Pulmonata: Hygromiidae). *Zoologische Mededelingen*. 67(18): 295–302.
- Gittenberger, E. 1993c. On *Trochoidea geyeri* (Soós, 1926) and some conchologically similar taxa (Mollusca: Gastropoda Pulmonata: Hygromiidae). *Zoologische Mededelingen*. 67(19): 303–320.

**Comment on the proposed conservation of the specific names of *Octopus vulgaris* Cuvier, [1797] and *Loligo vulgaris* Lamarck, 1798 (Mollusca, Cephalopoda)**  
(Case 2922; see BZN 52: 24–26, 333–335)

Marion Nixon

*Geology Department, Birkbeck College, Malet Street, London WC1E 6BT, U.K.*

I support the application by Drs Guerra and Alonso-Zarazaga. Both the names *Octopus vulgaris* Cuvier, [1797] and *Loligo vulgaris* Lamarck, 1798 are familiar in zoological works. Besides this, these animals have been widely used in experimental studies for more than 50 years, and are always referred to in the literature by these names, including neurophysiological, psychological and biochemical journals, and also in books. There would be confusion if these names were now changed.

**Comment on the proposed conservation of the specific names of *Dodecaceria concharum* Örsted, 1843 and *D. fimbriata* (Verrill, 1879) (Annelida, Polychaeta) by the designation of a neotype for *D. concharum***  
(Case 2899; see BZN 52: 27–33, 261–262, 329–331)

Kristian Fauchald

*The Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. 20560, U.S.A.*

Patricia A. Hutchings

*The Australian Museum, Sydney, N.S.W., Australia 2000*